

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action of July 27, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2. Response to Objection of Specification

The Examiner requested the Applicants to update the status of copending cases as mentioned in paragraph 0002 of the disclosure. Accordingly, the specification has been amended to include the serial numbers of the copending cases mentioned in paragraph 0002. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

3. Response to Objections of Claims

Claims 11, 12, 22, 23, 33, and 34 have been objected to because of the recitation of "computer settings" instead of "computer access settings." The claims have been amended to recite "computer access settings." Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

4. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Office Action states that it is not clearly explained how the updating of versions of the computer access settings is carried out. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that user access settings are stored in the computer and the remote database and that the remote database is accessible to the server. Therefore, a request to update user access settings in the remote database is provided to the server, in one embodiment. Applicants contend that claims 1-10 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-10 be withdrawn.

5. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 33-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action alleges that the subject matter of the claims is not limited to a process, machine, manufacture, or a composition of matter. Independent claim 33 has been amended to recite a tangible computer readable medium which is statutory subject matter. Therefore, claims 33-43 comply with 35 U.S.C. §101, and the rejections should be respectfully withdrawn.

6. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 11-13, 15-19, 22-24, 26-30, 33-35, and 37-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Heard* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0242685). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed subject matter must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). In the present case, not every feature of the claimed subject matter is represented in the *Heard* reference.

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A system for automatically updating of computer access settings, comprising:

at least one computer access setting for a respective user of a computer, one version of the at least one computer access setting being stored in a remote database and another version of the at least one computer access setting being stored in the computer;

a server to communicate with the remote database; and

a control unit to communicate with the server and to automatically update the versions of the at least one computer access settings in the computer and the remote database that is accessible to the server to coincide with each other responsive to at least one computer event, wherein the at least one computer access setting being stored in the remote database is updated to reflect

changes made to the at least one computer access setting being stored in the computer and vice versa.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Heard* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “a control unit to communicate with the server and to automatically update the versions of the at least one computer access settings in the computer and the remote database that is accessible to the server to coincide with each other responsive to at least one computer event, wherein the at least one computer access setting being stored in the remote database is updated to reflect changes made to the at least one computer access setting being stored in the computer and vice versa,” as emphasized above.

Rather, *Heard* describes a system where a server 102 sends a policy package to a gatekeeper 104. See para. 0071. “The gatekeeper 104, upon successful authentication of the mobile computing device, pushes the policy package to the mobile computing device.” Para. 0073. Accordingly, changes to a policy package are not sent from the computing device to the server 102 in *Heard*. For at least this reason, *Heard* fails to teach or suggest at least “a control unit to communicate with the server and to automatically update the versions of the at least one computer access settings in the computer and the remote database that is accessible to the server to coincide with each other responsive to at least one computer event, wherein the at least one computer access setting being stored in the remote database is updated to reflect changes made to the at least one computer access setting being stored in the computer and vice versa,” as recited in claim 1.

Hence, *Heard* does not anticipate claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 2 and 4-8

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 2 and 4-8 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2 and 4-8 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 11

As provided in independent claim 11, Applicants claim:

A system to automatically update computer access information, comprising:

means for creating computer access settings for a respective user of a computer;

means for storing a first version of the computer access settings in a remote location;

means for locally storing a second version of the computer access settings;

means for modifying the first version of the computer access settings; and

means for retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings upon at least one computer event, wherein the first version of computer access settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 11 is allowable for at least the reason that *Heard* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “means for retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings upon at least one computer event, wherein the first version of computer access settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa,” as emphasized above.

Rather, *Heard* describes a system where a server 102 sends a policy package to a gatekeeper 104. See para. 0071. “The gatekeeper 104, upon successful authentication of the mobile computing device, pushes the policy package to the mobile computing device.” Para. 0073. Accordingly, changes to a policy package are not sent from the computing device to the server 102 in *Heard*. For at least this reason, *Heard* fails to teach or suggest at least “means for retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings upon at least one

computer event, wherein the first version of computer access settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa,” as recited in claim 11.

Hence, *Heard* does not anticipate claim 11, and the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

d. Claims 12-13 and 15-19

For at least the reasons given above, claim 11 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 12-13 and 15-19 depend from claim 11 and recite additional features, claims 12-13 and 15-19 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Claim 22

As provided in independent claim 22, Applicants claim:

A method to automatically update computer access information, comprising:

creating computer access settings for a respective user of a computer;

storing a first version of the computer access settings in a remote location;

locally storing a second version of the computer access settings;

modifying the first version of the computer access settings; and

upon at least one computer event, retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings, wherein the first version of computer access settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 22 is allowable for at least the reason that *Heard* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “upon at least one computer event, retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings, wherein the first version of computer access

settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa,” as emphasized above.

Rather, *Heard* describes a system where a server 102 sends a policy package to a gatekeeper 104. See para. 0071. “The gatekeeper 104, upon successful authentication of the mobile computing device, pushes the policy package to the mobile computing device.” Para. 0073. Accordingly, changes to a policy package are not sent from the computing device to the server 102 in *Heard*. For at least this reason, *Heard* fails to teach or suggest at least “upon at least one computer event, retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings, wherein the first version of computer access settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa,” as recited in claim 22.

Hence, *Heard* does not anticipate claim 22, and the rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn.

f. Claims 23-24 and 26-30

For at least the reasons given above, claim 22 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 23-24 and 26-30 depend from claim 22 and recite additional features, claims 23-24 and 26-30 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

g. Claim 33

As provided in independent claim 33, Applicants claim:

A computer-readable medium for storing a program that controls computer access to Internet content, the computer-readable medium being a tangible medium and the program when executed by a processor causing the processor to perform:

creating computer access settings for a respective user of a computer;

storing a first version of the computer access settings in a remote location;
locally storing a second version of the computer access settings;
modifying the first version of the computer access settings; and
upon at least one computer event, retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings, wherein the first version of computer access settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 33 is allowable for at least the reason that *Heard* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “upon at least one computer event, retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings, wherein the first version of computer access settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa,” as emphasized above.

Rather, *Heard* describes a system where a server 102 sends a policy package to a gatekeeper 104. See para. 0071. “The gatekeeper 104, upon successful authentication of the mobile computing device, pushes the policy package to the mobile computing device.” Para. 0073. Accordingly, changes to a policy package are not sent from the computing device to the server 102 in *Heard*. For at least this reason, *Heard* fails to teach or suggest at least “upon at least one computer event, retrieving the first version of the computer access settings and updating the second version of the computer access settings to coincide with the first version of the computer access settings, wherein the first version of computer access settings being stored in the remote location is updated to reflect changes made to the second version of computer access settings being stored locally in the computer and vice versa,” as recited in claim 33.

Hence, *Heard* does not anticipate claim 33, and the rejection of claim 33 should be withdrawn.

h. Claims 34-35 and 37-41

For at least the reasons given above, claim 33 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 34-35 and 37-41 depend from claim 33 and recite additional features, claims 34-35 and 37-41 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

7. Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 20, 21, 25, 31, 32, 36, 42, and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Heard* in view of *Dunn* (U.S. Patent No. 7,076,558).

All of the claimed features of independent claims 1, 12, 22, and 33 are not taught and suggested by *Heard*, as previously discussed. Further, the cited art of *Dunn* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Heard* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the features of claims 1, 12, 22, and 23. Since claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 20, 21, 25, 31, 32, 36, 42, and 43 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 12, 22, or 23 and recite additional features, claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 20, 21, 25, 31, 32, 36, 42, and 43 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicants reserve the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicants. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500